



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,392	03/05/2002	Ioannis Katsavounidis	INTV.012A	8446
7590	0 09/14/2005	· ;	EXAMINER	
Rosenberg Klein & Lee 3458 Ellicott Center Drive-Suite 101			WONG, ALLEN C	
Ellicott City, MI			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,		·. ·	2613	•
		;	DATE MAIL ED: 00/14/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary 10/092,392		Application No. Applicant(s)							
Art Unit Allen Wong All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Allen Wong. (3) David Wood. (4) Date of Interview: 08 September 2005. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1,11 and 22. Identification of prior art discussed: Rhee (6,289,054), Avanoglu (5,600,663). Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.		10/092,392	KATSAVOUNIDIS ET AL.						
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Allen Wong. (3) David Wood. (2) Morton Rosenberg: (4) Date of Interview: 08 September 2005. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1.11 and 22. Identification of prior art discussed: Rhee (6,289,054), Ayanoglu (5,600,663). Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.	Interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	·					
(1) Allen Wong. (2) Morton Rosenberg: (4) Date of Interview: 08 September 2005. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes lf Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1.11 and 22. Identification of prior art discussed: Rhee (6.289,054), Ayanoglu (5,600,663). Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.		Allen Wong	2613						
(2) <u>Morton Rosenberg</u> . (4) Date of Interview: <u>08 September 2005</u> . Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)□ Yes e)⊠ No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: <u>1.11 and 22</u> . Identification of prior art discussed: <u>Rhee (6,289,054), Ayanoglu (5,600,663)</u> . Agreement with respect to the claims f)□ was reached. g)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):								
Date of Interview: 08 September 2005. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1.11 and 22. Identification of prior art discussed: Rhee (6,289,054), Ayanoglu (5,600,663). Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.	(1) Allen Wong.	(3) <i>David Wood</i> .		•					
Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1.11 and 22. Identification of prior art discussed: Rhee (6,289,054), Ayanoglu (5,600,663). Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.	(2) <u>Morton Rosenberg</u> :	(4)							
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1,11 and 22. Identification of prior art discussed: Rhee (6,289,054), Ayanoglu (5,600,663). Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.	Date of Interview: 08 September 2005.								
If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1,11 and 22. Identification of prior art discussed: Rhee (6,289,054), Ayanoglu (5,600,663). Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.									
Identification of prior art discussed: <i>Rhee</i> (6,289,054), <i>Ayanoglu</i> (5,600,663). Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.									
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.	Claim(s) discussed: 1,11 and 22.								
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	Identification of prior art discussed: Rhee (6,289,054), Ayanoglu (5,600,663).								
reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	Agreement with respect to the claims f)□ was reached. g)☑ was not reached. h)□ N/A.								
The same of the sa	Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .								
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)									
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.									

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representatives discussed proposed claim language and stated that none of the prior art teachings disclose the "selected portions being less than an entirety of a corresponding frame packet" and the "simultaneously concatenating only the selected portions of packet data from each of the plurality of frame packets into a concatenated bit field". The aforementioned proposed claim language appears to overcome the prior rejection, however, more consideration and search would be required.